

REMARKS

I. Overview

These remarks are set forth in response to the Decision of the BPAI. As this amendment has been timely filed within the two-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 14 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent in nature. In the Decision of the BPAI, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of each of claims 1-4, 8 and 10-12 as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication 20030007703 by Roylance were affirmed.

Additionally, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of claims 1, 2 and 7, 8 and 10 as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,563,955 to de Quiroz were affirmed. Yet further, the rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) of claims 6 and 14 as being obvious over de Queiroz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,017 to Shen et al. (Shen), and also over Roylance in view of Shen were affirmed. Finally, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 5 and 13 as being unpatentable over Roylance in view of Jong Whan Jang et al., "Performance Evaluation of Scene Change Detection Algorithms" (Jang) and also de Queiroz in view of Jang were affirmed.

In response, **Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 in accordance with the findings of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (the "Board") on page 10 of the Decision of the BPAI** in which the Board stated:

Roylance does teach a "shared application" which is the *image data being shared between the image processing device 118 and printer 110*. We note that Appellants' shared application is the image data of the rendered displayed image being shared between the Application Sharing host 110 and the Application Sharing Viewers 130 (Finding of Fact 6). **However, Appellants did not claim a "displayed rendered image data" as the *shared application*, and thus, the claim does not preclude sharing raw image data (or sharing the manipulated raw data itself) as the shared application.**

Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to specifically recite that the shared application includes displayed rendered image frames of the shared application hosted in the shared application host and shared between different application sharing viewers. Applicants further have amended claim 8 to specifically recite that the shared application viewers share image frames of a rendered displayed image for a shared application hosted by the application sharing host, the plurality of the shared application viewers each coupled to said host over a data communications network. Support for Applicants' amendments can be found through Applicants' specification, by way of example, paragraph [0018] of Applicants' published specification. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

II. Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 102(e) and 103(a) owing to the amended and cancelled claims and the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 29, 2009

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
Customer No. 46321